IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ELIPE DHARMA RAO

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 13351 of 2005

Between:

A.N. Jawahar, S/o. Durgaji Rao,
R/o. H.No. 11-3-357/15/A, Parsigutta, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad. Hyderabad.
2 The Additional Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad. Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondent in not extending the lease for one year i.e. 2005 to 2006 by deducting the polls at Sl.No. 3,4,5,7 and 8 issued in the work order vide proceedings No. 3642/ADB/ADVT/MCH/2004 dt. 27-4-2005 is unjust and against the principles of natural justice.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.NOOKAJAGANNADHAM

Counsel for the Respondents: MR.RAMA RAO GHANTA

The Court at the stage of admission made the following :

ORDER:-

This writ petition is filed to declare the action of the respondents in not extending the lease for one more year i.e., 2005 to 2006 by deducting the pools Sl.Nos.3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 issued in the work order proceedings dated 27-4-2005 is unjust and against the principles of natural justice on the ground that he was granted lease by the order dated 27-4-2004 for a period of one year starting from 1-4-2004 to 31-3-2005 with advertisements rights to display advertisements. Now after the said term, he made an application dated 16-5-2005 to the authorities for extension of the said lease period for one more year for the year 2005-2006. The said request of the petitioner was not considered by the Additional Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad and therefore, he filed this writ petition.

The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not able to show under what provision of law, the lease was granted in favour of the petitioner. Hence, it is very difficult for this Court to direct the respondents to extend the lease period for one more year. It is for the authorities to consider the same and pass appropriate orders.

Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of at the admission stage itself with a direction to the respondent authorities to consider the representation of the petitioner

dated 16-5-2005 and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law within four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

22—06—2005.

Stv/-

To

1 The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad. Hyderabad.
2 The Additional Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad. Hyderabad.

3 Two C.D. copies.